Case 4:04-cv-00321-RAS Document 1 Filed 09/14/04 Page 1 of 10 PageID #: 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS EASTERN DES SHERMAN DIVISION

FILED
U.S. DESTRUCTOF TEXAS

AND CLERK

SEP 1 4 2004

COMPLAINT

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION.

Plaintiff.

٧.

1) DEAN FOODS COMPANY, and

2) JOHN D. ROBINSON,

1 4.04cy321

Defendants.

Plaintiff, United States Securities and Exchange Commission, files this Complaint against Defendants Dean Foods Company ("Dean") and John D. Robinson ("Robinson")(collectively, "Defendants"), and would respectfully show the Court as follows:

SUMMARY

- 1. This case concerns Defendants' involvement in an illicit income recognition scheme perpetrated by Fleming Companies, Inc. ("Fleming").
- 2. Starting in late 2001, Fleming implemented a plan to improperly recognize material amounts of income to compensate for forecasted earnings shortfalls. Dean, a Fleming vendor, aided Fleming's scheme by providing a side letter that falsely described a \$2.5 million payment to Fleming. Robinson, who during the relevant time was the Senior Vice President of Sales and Marketing for the Dean Dairy Group, a business unit of Dean, was responsible for dealing with Fleming and signed the false letter.
- 3. Based on the conduct alleged herein, Dean and Robinson aided and abetted Fleming's violations of Sections 17(a)(2) and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act of 1933

("Securities Act") [15 U.S.C. §§ 77q(a)(2) and 77q(a)(3)] and Sections 13(a) and 13(b)(2)(A) of the Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") [15 U.S.C. §§ 78m(a) and 78m(b)(2)(A)], and Rules 12b-20, 13a-13 and 13b2-1, thereunder, [17 C.F.R. §§ 240.12b-20, 240.13a-13 and 240.13b2-1].

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. The Commission brings this action pursuant to the authority conferred upon it by Section 20(d) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77t(d)], and Sections 21(d)(3) and 27 of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d)(3) and 78aa].
- 5. This Court has jurisdiction over this action, and venue is proper, pursuant to Sections 20(d) and 22(a) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(d) and 77v(a)], and Sections 21(d)(3) and 27 of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d)(3) and 78aa].
- 6. Defendants, directly or indirectly, have made use of the means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or of the mails, or of the facilities of a national exchange in connection with the acts, practices, and courses of action alleged herein.
- 7. Venue is proper because Fleming is headquartered in Lewisville, Texas, and certain of the acts and transactions described herein took place in the Eastern District of Texas.

DEFENDANTS

- 8. **Dean**, a Delaware corporation headquartered in Dallas, Texas, is a processor and distributor of milk and other dairy products.
- 9. **Robinson**, of Dallas, Texas, was Senior Vice President of Sales and Marketing for the Dean Dairy Group, a business unit of Dean.

OTHER RELEVANT ENTITY

10. **Fleming** is an Oklahoma corporation headquartered in Lewisville, Texas. Fleming's stock is registered pursuant to Section 12 of the Exchange Act and, prior to filing for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection in April 2003, its stock traded on the New York Stock Exchange. Before bankruptcy, Fleming was the nation's largest grocery wholesaler and a retail grocery operator with approximately 50 distribution centers nationwide and more than 100 retail stores throughout the Midwestern and Western United States. In 2001, Fleming reported approximately \$15.6 billion in revenues and \$23.3 million in profits. In 2002, the company reported \$15.5 billion in revenues and a net loss of \$84 million.

FACTS

Fleming's improper initiatives to meet earnings expectations

- 11. During 2001 and the first half of 2002, and following a period of poor financial performance, Fleming improperly executed a series of transactions, called "initiatives," to fabricate earnings and "bridge the gap" between actual operating results and Wall Street expectations. In these initiatives, Fleming improperly structured otherwise ordinary transactions in forms that, on paper, would justify and maximize an immediate increase in earnings.
- 12. One of Fleming's frequently used initiatives was accelerating recognition of up-front payments received under forward-looking vendor agreements. Specifically, Fleming persuaded vendors to provide side letters that described up-front payments—that Fleming and the vendors plainly intended to secure future rights and services—as compensating some form of past performance, such as rebates or expenses. Fleming then used these letters to immediately book the entire up-front payment as an offset to

expenses, rather than over time as generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP") reauired.

13. As designed, the illicit reduction in expenses by Fleming significantly inflated the company's earnings in the fourth guarter of 2001 and the first two guarters of 2002 and allowed Fleming to meet securities analysts' earnings expectations.

Dean's participation in Fleming's inflated earnings

- 14. In early 2002, Fleming and Dean began negotiating a supply agreement under which Dean would provide Fleming's retail stores with milk for three years. Robinson was principally responsible for negotiating the supply agreement on Dean's behalf. Throughout the negotiations, Fleming made it clear that, to receive the supply agreement, Dean needed to make an "up-front" payment of approximately \$2 million. Ultimately, the parties agreed on an up-front payment of \$2.5 million.
- 15. As the negotiations were concluding, Fleming demanded that the payment provision be removed from the supply agreement and supplied Dean with a letter describing the payment as a "rebate" for "past performance." Fleming knew it had not earned any such rebate in this instance and, up to that point in the negotiations, the upfront payment was understood to be consideration for the future business being negotiated.
- 16. At the time of negotiations, Fleming was a sizable customer of Dean's dairy operations. Throughout negotiations, Dean knew it had no existing obligation to pay Fleming any rebate and that the \$2.5 million payment was to secure the supply agreement.

- 17. Fearing that Fleming would choose a different supplier, Dean acquiesced to Fleming's demand and Robinson signed the letter. To protect its interests, Dean demanded a penalty provision in the supply agreement that obligated Fleming to repay a prorated portion of the \$2.5 million if Fleming breached its contractual obligations.
- 18. In March 2002, Dean provided Fleming the requested side letter and upfront payment, but only after Fleming signed the supply agreement. Fleming used the side letter to justify recognizing the entire \$2.5 million as an offset to expenses in the first quarter of 2002, which accounted for approximately \$.03 per share of the \$.52 per share Fleming reported as earnings for the quarter.
- 19. Contrary to GAAP, Fleming relied on Dean's letter to justify recording the \$2.5 million as an offset to expenses, which equaled approximately 6% of the earnings Fleming reported for the first quarter. Fleming included these misleading figures in its Form 10-Q for the first quarter ended April 20, 2002, and in publicly disseminated press releases. Fleming incorporated the first quarter Form 10-Q into registration statements on Forms S-3, S-8, and S-4 filed with the Commission during the summer of 2002.

FIRST CLAIM

Aiding and Abetting Fleming's Violations of Sections 17(a)(2) and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act

(Against Dean and Robinson)

- 20. Paragraphs 1 through 19 are realleged and incorporated by reference.
- 21. Based on the conduct alleged herein, Fleming violated Sections 17(a)(2) and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 77q(a)(2) and 77q(a)(3)].

- 22. Defendants Dean and Robinson, acting alone or in concert with others, in the manner set forth above, knowingly provided substantial assistance to Fleming in connection with its violations of Sections 17(a)(2) and 17(a)(3) as alleged herein.
- 23. By reason of the foregoing, Dean and Robinson aided and abetted Fleming's violations of Sections 17(a)(2) and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 77q(a)(2) and 77q(a)(3)].

SECOND CLAIM

Aiding and Abetting Fleming's Violations of Sections 13(a) and 13(b)(2)(A)of the Exchange Act and Rules 12b-20, 13a-13 and 13b2-1 Thereunder

(Against Dean and Robinson)

- 24. Paragraphs 1 through 19 are realleged and incorporated by reference.
- 25. Based on the conduct alleged herein, Fleming violated Sections 13(a) and 13(b)(2)(A) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78m(a) and 78m(b)(2)(A)] and Rules 12b-20, 13a-13 and 13b2-1 thereunder [17 C.F.R. §§ 240.12b-20, 240.13a-13 and 240.13b2-1].
- 26. Defendants Dean and Robinson, acting alone or in concert with others, in the manner set forth above, aided and abetted Fleming, as an issuer of a security registered pursuant to Section 12 of the Exchange Act, in its failing to file with the Commission, in accordance with rules and regulations the Commission has prescribed, information and documents required by the Commission to keep reasonably current the information and documents required to be included in or filed with an application or registration statement filed pursuant to Section 12 of the Exchange Act and annual reports and quarterly reports as the Commission has prescribed.

27. Defendants Dean and Robinson, acting alone or in concert with others, in the manner set forth above, provided substantial assistance to Fleming, who, directly or indirectly, failed to make and keep books, records, and accounts, which, in reasonable detail, accurately and fairly reflected Fleming's transactions and dispositions of its assets.

28. By reason of the foregoing, Dean and Robinson aided and abetted Fleming's violations of Sections 13(a) and 13(b)(2)(A) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78m(a) and 78m(b)(2)(A)] and Rules 12b-20, 13a-13 and 13b2-1 thereunder [17 C.F.R. §§ 240.12b-20, 240.13a-13 and 240.13b2-1].

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

The Commission respectfully requests that the Court:

I.

Enter an order directing Dean to pay a \$400,000 civil money penalty pursuant to Section 21(d)(3) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(3)] and Section 20(d) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77t(d)].

II.

Enter an order directing Robinson to pay a \$50,000 civil money penalty pursuant to Section 21(d)(3) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(3)] and Section 20(d) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77t(d)].

III.

Grant such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

(Attorney in charge)

Texas Bar No. 00798134

Attorney for Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission Burnett Plaza, Suite 1900 801 Cherry Street, Unit #18 Fort Worth, TX 76102-6882 (817) 978-6438 (817) 978-4927 (fax) E-Mail: davistp@sec.gov

Of Counsel:

SPENCER C. BARASCH D.C. Bar No. 388886 DAVID L. PEAVLER Texas Bar No. 00784738 JAMES E. ETRI Texas Bar No. 24002061



Case 4:04-cv-00321-RAS Document 1 Filed 09/14/04 Page 9 of 10 Page 10 # 19 ORIGINAL **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY Receipt # AM	TNUC	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUDGE		
09/14/2004	Sidiv	mally P. E	Ja-					
IF ANY	J	UDGE		·	DOCKET NUM	•		
VIII. RELATED CASE(S)			simu	ltaneously	filed: see attac			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23			DEMAND \$		CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND ☐ YES ☒ NO		
CAUSE OF ACTION (CIT DIVERSITY.) Sections 17(a)(2) Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act of 1934).	& (3) of the Securities	Act of 1933 ("Securities	s Act	") I15 U.S.C	C. §§ 77q(a)(2) & (3	3)]; Sections 13(a) & 13(b)(2	(A) of the Securities	
Proceeding S	itate Court A	peliate Court	Reop	pened	5 Transferred from another district (Specify)	Litigation	☐ 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judge	
V. ORIGIN		(PLACE AN "X" IN ON	E BC	OX ONLY)		***************************************		
290 All Other Real Property	440 Other Civil	☐ 550 Civil Rights	Gecund		rey a tool	20 000 1000	State Statutes State Statutes B90 Other Statutory Actions	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare	☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other		☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act		Defendant) Def Plantin Grant D	Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment	510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus:		☐ 740 Railway Labor Act ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation		FEDERAL TAX SUITS B870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or	☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act ☐ 900 Appeal of Fee	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	□ 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS		Disclosure Act		☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury			_	abor Standards Act /Mgmt. Relations	☐ 861 HIA (1395FF) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act	
☐ 153 Recovery OF Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage		690 Oth	er LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine PROPER ☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud		IY G50 Airline Regs. G60 Occupational Safe		pational Safety/Health	820 Copy rights 830 Patient	☐ 810 Selective Service ☐ 850 Securities	
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability	Liability 365 Personal Injury - 370 Assault, Libel & Product Liability Slander 370 Federal 368 Asbestos Personal				PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations	
 ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment 	320 Assault, Libel &				Related Seizure of erty 21 USC 881 or Laws	☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc.	
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJURY 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice			er Food & Drug	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 156	☐ 400 State Reapprotionment ☐ 410 Antitrust	
CONTRACT	.T.	TORTS			TURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (F	Fo	Foreign Country Foreign Nation						
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)			Citizen or Subject of a		☐ 2 Incorporated and Principal Place ☐ 5 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 of Business in Another State		
∆ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)					of Business In This		
MAUS Covernment Da Foder LO Cover				(For Diversity Cases Only) PTF PTF Citizen of This State □ 1 □ 1 Incorporated or Principal Place □ 4 □ 4				
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY) III. C					CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX FOR PLANTIFF AND ONE BOX FOR PLANTIFF			
SECURITIES & EXCI Burnett Plaza, Suite 801 Cherry Street, U Fort Worth, TX 7610 817/978-6438	1900 nit #18	ON		i				
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION (b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) ATTORNEY (FIRM NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER) Timothy P. Davis, Esq. SECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSION				181	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant: DALLAS, TX (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. ATTORNEYS (IF KNOWN) See attached listing			
					DEAN FOODS COMPANY and JOHN D. ROBINSON			
I.(a) PLAINTIFF					DEFENDANTS			
law, except as provided by the Clerk of Court for the p	local rules of court. T	his form, approved by t	he Ju	udicial Conf	erence of the Unite	and service of pleadings or o ed States in September 197 ERSE OF THE FORM.)	other papers as required by 4, is required for the use of	

I.(c) - COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS

Harry J. Weiss, Esq.
WILMER, CUTLER & PICKERING
2445 M. St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20037
202/663-6993
Counsel for Defendant Dean Foods Co.

David R. McAtee, Esq.
AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER & FELD, LLP
1700 Pacific Avenue
Ste. 4100
Dallas, TX
214/969-2736
Counsel for Defendant John D. Robinson

VIII. - RELATED CASES

SEC v. John K. Adams

SEC v. Bruce Keith Jensen

SEC v. Kemps LLC, f/k/a Marigold Foods LLC, James Green and Christopher Thorpe

SEC v. Digital Exchange Systems, Inc., Rosario Coniglio & Steven Schmidt